

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
MEDFORD DIVISION**

**RICARDO ORDONEZ GREGORIO;  
GILBERTO GARCIA ORDONEZ;  
ANDRES ORDONEZ JIMENEZ;  
GABRIEL GREGORIO HERNANDEZ;  
JULIO CARDONA ORDONEZ; JOAQUIN  
ORDONEZ CARDONA; ALFREDO  
ORDONEZ CARDONA; ALICIA  
HERNANDEZ GREGORIO; ELMER  
ESCALANTE GREGORIO; ROGELIO  
ORDONEZ ANDRES; ISMAEL ORDONEZ  
ANDRES; GABRIEL GARCIA ORDONEZ;  
ANDRES SANTOS VELASQUEZ;  
CELESTINO HERNANDEZ CARDONA;  
JUAN ANDRES GOMEZ; ANDRES  
VELASQUEZ FABIAN; CEFERINO LEONEL  
GOMEZ,**

Plaintiffs,

No. 1:21-cv-01078-CL

v.

**ORDER**

**COLT JAMISON HANSEN; WESTCOAST  
GROWERS, LLC; TOPSHELF HEMP, LLC;  
FIRE HEMP, LLC,**

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on a Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) filed by Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke. ECF No. 50. The Court previously adopted an F&R recommending terminating sanctions against Defendants and default judgment in favor of Plaintiffs. ECF Nos. 41, 43. Plaintiffs were ordered to submit a

memorandum of damages, ECF No. 48, which Judge Clarke recommends be awarded in full.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

For those portions of a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”). Although no review is required in the absence of objections, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Id.* at 154. The Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court should review the recommendation for “clear error on the face of the record.”

In this case, no party has filed objections to the F&R. The Court has reviewed the F&R and finds no error. The F&R, ECF No. 50, is therefore ADOPTED. Plaintiffs are awarded total damages in the amount of \$388,682 as set forth in the F&R, as well

court costs in the amount of \$402 and attorney fees in the amount of \$22,127.60.

Final judgment shall be entered accordingly.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 20th day of October 2022.

/s/Ann Aiken  
ANN AIKEN  
United States District Judge